## REMARKS

Claims 50-54, 56-63, 65-69 and 72-73 remain in this application. Claims 50, 57-58, 60 and 66-67 have been amended. Claims 70-71 have been canceled. By these amendments, no new matter has been added. Support for the amendments to Claims 50, 57-58, 60 and 66-67 may be found at Fig. 5 and the accompanying discussion on page 15, lines 10-24. Support for new Claims 70-71 may be found at page 9, lines 20-28.

Claims 50-53, 60-62, 68-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Weinberg et al. (US 6,237,006) in view of Bloomberg (US 5,765,176); Claims 54, 56-58, 63 and 65-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Weinberg, Bloomberg and further in view of Astiz (US 6,035,330); and Claim 59 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Weinberg, Bloomberg, Astiz, and further in view of Sitka (US 6,330,572). All of these rejections are respectfully traversed.

Weinberg remains deficient in that it discloses a fundamentally different database management method from the Web page information assessment method recited in Claim 50. Weinberg discloses a diagnostic tool to be used by a Webmaster in evaluating the performance and effectiveness of Web sites. The diagnostic tool of Weinberg shows the relationships between interlinked web pages using star or tree-type diagrams, but does not provide a preview of the displayed content of the web pages via a map of target pages, as defined by the independent claims. See, e.g., Figs. 1-6. According to Weinberg, each content object (HTML documents, GIF files, etc.) of the Web site is represented as a node on the star or tree diagram. Col. 2, lines 1048. Each of the nodes is represented with an icon, rather than as an actual block of text or reduced-size image from the target pages or linked related pages. Id.

It is acknowledged that Weinberg fails to teach or suggest the elements of (a) automatically selecting "a block of text from at least one of the target pages or the linked related pages having text" and "an image file from at least one of the target pages or the linked related pages displaying an image;" and (b) "generating a reduced-size image

from the selected image file" as defined by claims 50 and 60. Furthermore, Weinberg fails to disclose a method that (c) involves generating map information for the target pages and each set of linked related pages, wherein the map information comprises "hyperlinks referencing the target pages" as recited in claim 50, and similarly defined in claim 60. These claims further require the map information to be "configured such that, when the map information is displayed at a remote client as a map of a target page, a user can preview information content of the target page and can select ones of the hyperlinks from the map of the target page to receive map information for corresponding ones of the related pages." Instead, Weinberg discloses mapping hyperlinks between Web pages as lines in a map diagram. Such depictions are not operative in that the drawn lines do not operate as hyperlinks to another web page, but merely graphically depict that the pages are linked. Weinberg also discloses listing URL's of target pages in a split screen mode (see Col. 17:20-27 and Fig. 4), but again, falls short of disclosing including operative hyperlinks in a map of a target page.

Bloomberg does not make up for these deficiencies of Weinberg. Bloomberg merely discloses providing iconic rectangular blocks of illegible "greeked text," as in a thumbnail image, for documents in a database. Col. 5, line 63 — col. 6, line 24. The text itself is not provided; just a graphical representation of text. Fig. 3; col. 11, lines 5-7. If the original text is large enough, for example, heading text, the reduced-size image may be legible, but for normal-size original text, the reduced size image is not legible. Legibility of the image depends on the original text size, and Bloomberg is not concerned about whether or not the text is readable. Bloomberg, therefore, does not disclose generating a map including text for a user to preview information content of a Web page. Bloomberg is instead concerned with generating an iconic image of a document for document image management applications. Col. 5, line 63 — col. 6, line 11. In addition, one of ordinary skill would not have been motivated to apply the teaching of Bloomberg to generate a map including text for a user to preview information on a Web page, because Bloomberg teaches that most text on a document

-- meaning normal-size text -- will be rendered illegible when greeked.

Moreover, Bloomberg is not concerned with mapping a linked Web site or hyperlinked documents. Like Weinberg, Bloomberg therefore fails to disclose or suggest generating map information for the target pages and each set of linked related pages, wherein the map information comprises "hyperlinks referencing the target pages" as recited in claims 50 and 60.

Failing to disclose every element of independent claims 50 and 60, the combination of Weinberg and Bloomberg fail to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Claims 50 and 60 are therefore patentable. The remaining claims are also patentable, at least as depending from an allowable base claim.

Further with respect to claims 54, 56-58, 63 and 65-67, Astiz does not make up for the deficiencies of Weinberg and Bloomberg. Astiz is merely cited for disclosing storing map information in a database, and for use of a mouse to access a web map. Col. 9:31 -- 10:50. Astiz fails to disclose or suggest providing map information for a map of a target page, including hyperlinks that can be selected by a user "to receive map information for corresponding ones of the related pages," as defined by claims 50 and 60. Instead, Astiz discloses:

> the map maker 14 generates a map icon which is automatically displayed by browser 12 whenever the user is browsing that web site. A user displays the web site map by clicking for example on that map icon displayed on the browser display screen.

Col. 9:34-38. This map icon, however is not part of the map information for a target page, and is instead displayed by a web browser. Astiz therefore does not read on claims 50 and 60, which require that the hyperlink be included with map information "configured such that, when the map information is displayed at a remote client as a map of a target page, a user can preview information content of the target page and can select ones of the hyperlinks from the map of the target page to receive map information for corresponding ones of the related pages."

Astiz also discloses:

> [t]o go directly to a map entry such as an HTML page, the user simply
> selects a map entry, e.g., clicks his mouse while pointing to one of the
> entries in the displayed navigational web site map. In response, the map
> viewer 18 and browser 12 retrieve the specified HTML page.

Col. 10:45-49. This differs from what is claimed, because the "map entry" does not link to a map of the indicated page. Instead, the map entry links to the page itself. Astiz therefore does not make up for the deficiencies of Weinberg and Bloomberg in this respect. Claims 57 and 66 further define operation of a hyperlink as a way to access a map of a related page, that is not disclosed by Astiz. Likewise, Sitka is merely cited to show deletion of data from a database, and does not make up for the deficiencies of the other references.

New claims 72-73 are, in addition, believed to define patentable subject matter. None of the references of record discloses or suggests "automatically selecting the plurality of target pages for generating map information using predetermined criteria applied to query results returned by an Internet search engine."

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 50-54, 56-63, 65-69 and 72-73 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested, and a timely Notice of Allowability is solicited. If it would be helpful to placing this application in condition for allowance, the Applicant encourages the Examiner to contact the undersigned counsel and conduct a telephonic interview.

Applicants hereby petition for a one-month extension of time for filing an Appeal Brief or RCE after the Notice of Appeal filed November 8, 2006. A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) accompanies this response. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-3683.

Serial No. 09/549,505
February 8, 2007
Page 11

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 8, 2007

Jonathan Jaech
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 41,091

CUSTOMER
NUMBER

**Connolly Bove Lodge & Hutz LLP**
P.O. Box 2207
Wilmington, DE 19899
(213) 787-2500

**58688**
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

10177_1